

UNITED STAT DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 6185 C VAN DEN AKER 05/11/99 09/309,747 **EXAMINER** QM12/0308 TRINH, M BRIAN J HAMILLA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT **ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER FC/BERG ELECTRONICS GROUP INC 3729 825 OLD TRAIL ROAD ETTERS PA 17319 DATE MAILED: 03/08/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

i

	Application No.	Applicant(s	5)	
Office Action Summary	09/309,747	VAN DEN A	VAN DEN AKER, CORNELIS G.J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Minh Trinh	3729		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·			
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ TI	nis action is non-fi	nal.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>13-24 and 29-36</u> is/are pending in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>13-24 and 29-36</u> is/are rejected.				
7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claims are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.				
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.				
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.				
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. \$ 119				
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. \$ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).				
Attachment(s)	_			
 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 	18) 19) 20)			

Art Unit: 3729

DETAILED ACTION

- The amendment filed in Paper No. 10 is fully considered and made of record.
 Claims 13-24 and 29-36 are now pending in the application.
- 2. This application has been filed with informal drawings, which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: misspelling "the" in page 9, line 6.

The term's sidewall, item 40 (of claim 20), however, is not agreed with item 40 of page 12 of the specification. Applicant should carefully revise the disclosure and correct other typos in the claims to clearly recite the method step of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claims 13-24, 29-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3729

In claims 13, 20, 29, the functional recitation "--adapted to " has not given patentable weight because it is not a positive structural limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- 2. Claims 13, 17, 19, 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by DE 4329902.

DE 4329902 teaches a press block 3 having a generally planar base (fig 1, ltem); a plurality of discrete opening through the base, each opening adapted to receive a respective one of the terminals 8 (figure 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 3729

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 14-16, 20, 21-24, 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 4329902.

DE 4329902 as advanced above meet every structural of the claimed invention limitation except for the material structural of the press block. However, metal injection molded is old and well known. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice since the applicant has not disclosed that the use of metal injection molded solves any stated problems or is for any particular purposed and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with any of the equivalent conventional type moldable thermoplastic.

Regarding claim 36, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the opening of whatever form or shape was desired or expedient. A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24,29-32 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of Final rejection.

Art Unit: 3729

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Trinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-2887. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Friday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lee Young can be reached on (703) 308 2572. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7307 for regular communications and (703) 305-3579 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3729

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

mt March 6, 2001

LEE YOUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700